

**UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK**

**SECURITIES INVESTOR PROTECTION
CORPORATION,**

Plaintiff-Applicant,

v.

**BERNARD L. MADOFF INVESTMENT
SECURITIES LLC,**

Defendant.

In re:

BERNARD L. MADOFF,

Debtor.

**IRVING H. PICARD, Trustee for the Liquidation
of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC,**

Plaintiff,

v.

**UBS AG, UBS (LUXEMBOURG) SA, UBS
FUND SERVICES (LUXEMBOURG) SA, UBS
THIRD PARTY MANAGEMENT COMPANY
SA, ACCESS INTERNATIONAL ADVISORS
LLC, ACCESS INTERNATIONAL ADVISORS
LTD., ACCESS MANAGEMENT
LUXEMBOURG SA (f/k/a ACCESS
INTERNATIONAL ADVISORS
(LUXEMBOURG) SA) as represented by its
Liquidator MAÎTRE FERNAND ENTRINGER,
ACCESS PARTNERS SA as represented by its
Liquidator MAÎTRE FERNAND ENTRINGER,
PATRICK LITTAYE, CLAUDINE MAGON DE
LA VILLEHUCHET (a/k/a CLAUDINE DE LA
VILLEHUCHET) in her capacity as Executrix
under the Will of THIERRY MAGON DE LA
VILLEHUCHET (a/k/a RENE THIERRY DE LA
VILLEHUCHET), CLAUDINE MAGON DE LA
VILLEHUCHET (a/k/a CLAUDINE DE LA
VILLEHUCHET) individually as the sole
beneficiary under the Will of THIERRY MAGON
DE LA VILLEHUCHET (a/k/a RENE THIERRY**

Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB)

SIPA LIQUIDATION

(Substantively Consolidated)

Adv. Pro. No. 10-04285 (SMB)

DE LA VILLEHUCHET), PIERRE
DELANDMETER, THEODORE DUMBAULD,
LUXALPHA SICAV as represented by its
Liquidators MAÎTRE ALAIN RUKAVINA and
PAUL LAPLUME, MAÎTRE ALAIN
RUKAVINA AND PAUL LAPLUME, in their
capacities as liquidators and representatives of
LUXALPHA SICAV, GROUPEMENT
FINANCIER LTD.,

Defendants.

**STIPULATED FINAL ORDER GRANTING MOTION TO DISMISS
COUNTS TWO AND NINE OF THE AMENDED COMPLAINT**

Plaintiff Irving H. Picard (the “Trustee”), as trustee of the substantively consolidated liquidation proceeding of Bernard L. Madoff Investment Securities LLC (“BLMIS”), under the Securities Investor Protection Act (“SIPA”), 15 U.S.C. §§ 78aaa *et seq.*, and the estate of Bernard L. Madoff, individually, and UBS AG, UBS (Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Fund Services (Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Third Party Management Company S.A., Access International Advisors Ltd., Access Management Luxembourg SA f/k/a Access International Advisors (Luxembourg) SA, as represented by its Liquidator Maître Fernand Entringer, Access Partners SA, as represented by its Liquidator Maître Fernand Entringer, Patrick Littaye, and Pierre Delandmeter (the “Defendants”) (collectively, the “Parties”), by and through their undersigned counsel, state as follows:

WHEREAS, on November 23, 2010, the Trustee initiated the above-captioned adversary proceeding by filing a complaint in the United States Bankruptcy Court for the Southern District of New York (the “Bankruptcy Court”). *See Picard v. UBS AG*, No. 10-04285 (SMB), ECF No. 1;

WHEREAS, on August 17, 2011, the Trustee filed an Amended Complaint in the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York following withdrawal of the reference to the Bankruptcy Court with respect to motions to dismiss certain common law claims. *See Picard v. UBS AG, 11 Civ. 4212 (CM)*, ECF No. 23;

WHEREAS, on May 15, 2012 and June 7, 2012, respectively, the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York, the Honorable Jed S. Rakoff, entered Orders in which he withdrew the reference in certain adversary proceedings pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 157(d) to determine whether SIPA and/or the Bankruptcy Code as incorporated by SIPA apply extraterritorially, permitting the Trustee to avoid initial transfers that were received abroad or to recover from initial, immediate, or mediate foreign transferees (the “Extraterritoriality Issue”).

See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC, No. 12-mc-0115 (JSR), ECF Nos. 97 and 167;

WHEREAS, after consolidated briefing and oral argument on the Extraterritoriality Issue, *see id.*, ECF Nos. 234, 309, 310, 322, and 357, on July 7, 2014, Judge Rakoff entered an Opinion and Order (the “Extraterritoriality Order”) and returned the withdrawn adversary proceedings to the Bankruptcy Court for further proceedings consistent with the Extraterritoriality Order. *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, 513 B.R. 222 (S.D.N.Y. 2014);

WHEREAS, on July 28, 2014, Judge Rakoff entered a Stipulation and Supplemental Opinion and Order in which he supplemented the Extraterritoriality Order to direct that certain additional adversary proceedings should “also be returned to the Bankruptcy Court for further proceedings consistent with” the Extraterritoriality Order. *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, No. 12-mc-0115 (JSR), ECF No. 556;

WHEREAS, on December 10, 2014, the Bankruptcy Court entered an Order concerning further proceedings on Extraterritoriality Issue that directed the Defendants, the Trustee, and the Securities Investor Protection Corporation to submit supplemental briefing to address (a) which counts asserted in the adversary proceeding against the Defendants should be dismissed pursuant to the Extraterritoriality Order or the legal standards announced therein and (b) whether the Trustee shall be permitted to file an amended complaint containing allegations relevant to the Extraterritoriality Issue as proffered by the Trustee (together, the “Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss”). *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB), ECF No. 8800;

WHEREAS, on December 31, 2014, each of the Defendants, except Delandmeter, filed a consolidated memorandum of law in support of the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss. *See Picard v. UBS AG, et al.*, Adv. Pro. No. 10-04285 (SMB), ECF Nos. 193 and 194;

WHEREAS, pursuant to further scheduling Orders, *see Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB), ECF Nos. 8990, 9350, and 9720, on June 26, 2015, the Trustee filed (a) a consolidated memorandum of law in opposition to the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss, *see Picard v. UBS AG, et al.*, Adv. Pro. No. 10-04285 (SMB), ECF No. 207 (b) supplemental memoranda in opposition to the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss, *see id.*, ECF Nos. 208 and 209, and (c) a proposed second amended complaint. *See id.*, ECF No. 210;

WHEREAS, on September 30, 2015, the Defendants filed (a) a consolidated reply memorandum of law in support of the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss, *see id.*, ECF No. 213, and (b) supplemental reply memoranda in support of the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss. *See id.*, ECF Nos. 212, 214 and 215;

WHEREAS, on December 16, 2015, the Bankruptcy Court heard oral argument on the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss. *See Securities Investor Prot. Corp. v. Bernard L. Madoff Inv. Sec. LLC*, Adv. Pro. No. 08-01789 (SMB), ECF No. 12081;

WHEREAS, on November 22, 2016, the Bankruptcy Court issued a Memorandum Decision Regarding Claims to Recover Foreign Subsequent Transfers (the “Memorandum Decision”) that granted the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss as to the Defendants. *See SIPC v. BLMIS (In re BLMIS)*, No. 08-01789 (SMB) (Bankr. S.D.N.Y. Nov. 22, 2016), ECF No. 14495;

WHEREAS, the Memorandum Decision directed that the Trustee’s claims in this adversary proceeding should be dismissed as to Counts Two and Nine with respect to the Defendants (the “Dismissed Claims”);

WHEREAS, the Parties have agreed to consent to the Bankruptcy Court’s entry of final orders and judgments consistent with the Memorandum Decision in this adversary proceeding;

WHEREAS, the Parties further request that the Bankruptcy Court enter a final judgment solely as to the Dismissed Claims under Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure on the grounds that an immediate appellate review of the Memorandum Decision will be efficient for the courts and the Parties;

NOW, for the reasons set forth in the Memorandum Decision, which is incorporated herein and attached hereto as Exhibit A, the Parties agree and stipulate and the Bankruptcy Court hereby orders:

1. The Bankruptcy Court has subject matter jurisdiction over this adversary proceeding under 28 U.S.C. § 1334(b) and (e)(1) and 15 U.S.C. § 78eee (b)(2)(A) and (b)(4).

2. The Parties expressly and knowingly grant their consent solely for the Bankruptcy Court to enter final orders and judgments with respect to the Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss, whether the underlying claims are core under 28 U.S.C. § 157(b)(2) or non-core under 28 U.S.C. § 157(c)(2), subject to appellate review, including under 28 U.S.C. § 158. Notwithstanding the above grant of consent, the Defendants reserve all other jurisdictional, substantive, or procedural rights and remedies in connection with this adversary proceeding, including with respect to the Bankruptcy Court's power to finally determine any other matters in this adversary proceeding.

3. The Extraterritoriality Motion to Dismiss is **GRANTED** as to the Dismissed Claims against the Defendants.

4. The entry of a final order and judgment dismissing the Dismissed Claims in this adversary proceeding pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b) is appropriate. To permit entry of a final order and judgment under Fed. R. Civ. P. 54(b), there must be multiple claims or multiple parties, at least one claim finally decided within the meaning of 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and an express determination that there is no just reason for delay. *In re Air Crash at Belle Harbor, N.Y.*, 490 F.3d 99, 108–09 (2d Cir. 2007).

5. The operative complaint and the proposed second amended complaint filed in this adversary proceeding allege multiple claims and name multiple defendants. The entry of a final order and judgment will finally decide and ultimately dispose of the Dismissed Claims, which present legal issues that can be adjudicated independently of the remaining claims.

6. There is no just reason for delay of entry of a final order and judgment on the Dismissed Claims. In light of the number of adversary proceedings, claims and defendants in the above-captioned substantively consolidated adversary proceeding affected by the Memorandum

Decision, the interests of sound judicial administration and the realization of judicial efficiencies are served by the entry of this final order and judgment, together with the entry of all other final orders and judgments dismissing other claims brought by the Trustee in the above-captioned substantively consolidated adversary proceeding pursuant to the Memorandum Decision (“Related Final Orders and Judgments”), and the opportunity for an immediate appeal.

7. Because this order and judgment and the dismissal of the Dismissed Claims, together with Related Final Orders and Judgments, will affect numerous adversary proceedings commenced by the Trustee and hundreds of defendants named in those complaints or proposed amended complaints, an immediate appeal would avoid protracted, expensive, and potentially duplicative litigation proceedings, and will facilitate the prompt resolution of the case, thereby providing certainty and helping to streamline the litigation for further proceedings and possible appeals.

8. The Parties’ request that the Bankruptcy Court enter final orders and judgments solely as to the Dismissed Claims under Rule 54(b) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure is **GRANTED.**

[Signature Page Follows]

Dated: January 20, 2017
New York, New York

By: /s/ David J. Sheehan
BAKER & HOSTETLER LLP
45 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10111
Telephone: (212) 589-4200
Facsimile: (212) 589-4201
David J. Sheehan
Email: dsheehan@bakerlaw.com
Oren J. Warshavsky
Email: owarshavsky@bakerlaw.com

*Attorneys for Plaintiff Irving H. Picard,
Trustee for the substantively consolidated
SIPA Liquidation of Bernard L. Madoff
Investment Securities LLC and the Estate of
Bernard L. Madoff*

By: /s/ Marshall R. King
GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP
200 Park Avenue
New York, New York 10166-0193
Telephone: (212) 351-4000
Facsimile: (212) 351-4035
Marshall R. King
Email: mking@gibsondunn.com
Gabriel Herrmann
Email: gherrmann@gibsondunn.com

*Attorneys for Defendants UBS AG, UBS
(Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Fund Services
(Luxembourg) S.A., UBS Third Party Management
Company S.A.*

By: /s/ Anthony Paccione
KATTEN MUCHIN ROSENMAN LLP
575 Madison Avenue
New York, New York 10022-2585
Telephone: (212) 940-8800
Facsimile: (212) 940-8774
Anthony Paccione
Email: anthony.paccione@kattenlaw.com

*Attorneys for Defendants Access
International Advisors Ltd., Access
Management Luxembourg SA (f/k/a Access
International Advisors (Luxembourg) SA),
as represented by its Liquidator Maître
Fernand Entringer, Access Partners SA,
Patrick Littaye, as represented by its
Liquidator Maître Fernand Entringer*

By: /s/ Scott Berman
**FRIEDMAN, KAPLAN, SEILER & ADELMAN
LLP**
7 Times Square
New York, New York 10036
Telephone: (212) 833-1120
Facsimile: (212) 373-7920
Scott Berman
Email: sberman@fklaw.com

Attorneys for Defendant Pierre Delandmeter

Dated: March 9, 2017
New York, New York

/s/ STUART M. BERNSTEIN
HONORABLE STUART M. BERNSTEIN
UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY JUDGE